

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appln. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 2

REMARKS

In the Office Action of February 9, 2005, the Examiner has indicated, and the Applicant acknowledges, that claims 1-36 remain pending. The Applicants wish to acknowledge and to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter with regard to claims 19-22, 26, 27 and 30-36.

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her courtesy extended to Applicant's representative Mr. James Shultz during a telephone interview conducted on May 4, 2005. The substance of the interview is included herein.

As an initial matter, the Examiner has pointed to the element associated with reference numeral (33) of Angell et al. as a controller. As discussed in the specification of Angell et al. reference numeral (33) is actually a circuit board (col. 2, line 51, for example). Angell et al. does not even disclose having a "controller" let alone one that is configured as recited in the independent claims of the current application.

Turning to paragraph two of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,821,867, to Angell et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appn. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 3

The Applicants respectfully submit that Angell et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a transflective reflector with respect to a viewer; and a controller configured to generate a light source control signal as a function of light rays originating from said light source and light rays reflected by said reflector as recited in claim 1 of the present application. In that claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, the Applicants submit that claims 1-3 are in condition for allowance over Angell et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Angell et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a transflective reflector with respect to a viewer; and a controller configured to receive a light level signal, said controller is further configured to generate a light source control signal as a function of light rays originating from said light source and light rays reflected by said reflector when said light level signal is above a threshold as recited in claim 5 of the present application. In that claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5, the Applicants submit that claims 5-7 are in condition for allowance over Angell et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Angell et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a transflective reflector with respect to a viewer; and a controller configured to control a ratio of light rays originating from said light source with respect to light rays reflected by said reflector as recited in claim 9 of the present application. In that claims 10 and 11

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appn. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 4

depend from claim 9, the Applicants submit that claims 9-11 are in condition for allowance over Angell et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Angell et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a variable reflectance transreflective reflective element with respect to a viewer; and a controller configured to control a ratio of light rays originating from said light source with respect to light rays reflected by said reflector by controlling either: a light source brightness, a reflective element reflectance, or both a light source brightness and a reflective element reflectance as recited in claim 13 of the present application. In that claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13, the Applicants submit that claims 13-15 are in condition for allowance over Angell et al.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Angell et al. does not teach or suggest a vehicle information display assembly, comprising: a light source positioned behind a variable reflectance transreflective element; and a controller configured to receive a light level signal, said controller is further configured to determine when said light level signal is above a threshold and to generate a light source control signal as a function of either; a light source brightness, a reflective element reflectance, or both a light source brightness and a reflective element reflectance; when said light level signal is above said threshold as recited in claim 17 of the present application. Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 17 is in condition for allowance over Angell et al.

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appn. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 5

Turning to paragraph four of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 4, 8, 12, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Angell et al. as applied to claim 17 and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,285,069, to Larson et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons. The Applicants submit that since claim 4 depends from claim 1 and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 1 that claim 4 is in condition for allowance over Angell et al., Larson et al. and the combination. The Applicants submit that since claim 8 depends from claim 5 and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 5 that claim 8 is in condition for allowance over Angell et al., Larson et al. and the combination. The Applicants submit that since claim 12 depends from claim 9 and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 9 that claim 12 is in condition for allowance over Angell et al., Larson et al. and the combination. The Applicants submit that since claim 16 depends from claim 13 and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 13 that claim 16 is in condition for allowance over Angell et al., Larson et al. and the combination. The Applicants submit that since claim 18 depends from claim 17 and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 17 that claim 18 is in condition for allowance over Angell et al., Larson et al. and the combination.

Turning to paragraph five of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 23-25, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Angell et al. In view of U.S. Patent 6,020,987, to Baumann et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse

Applicant : William L. Tonar et al.
Appln. No. : 10/777,846
Page : 6

this rejection for the following reasons. The Applicants submit that since claims 23-25, 28 and 29 depend from claim 17, and in light of the above discussion regarding the patentability of claim 17, that claims 23-25, 28 and 29 are in condition for allowance over Angell et al., Baumann et al. and the combination.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this case and requests removal of the rejections. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please contact the undersigned should additional information be required.

Respectfully submitted,
WILLIAM L. TONAR ET AL.
By: Gentex Corporation

Mar 6, 2005
Date

J. E. Shultz Jr.
James E. Shultz Jr.
Registration No. 50,511
600 N. Centennial Street
Zeeland, Michigan 49464
(616) 772-1800